

REPORT TO CONGRESS

**ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES**

**Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Julius Genachowski, Chairman**

JULY 22, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraph
I. Introduction	2
II. Background	2
III. Discussion	4
A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges	4
B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2008.....	7
C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services	9
D. Indian Tribes	13
IV. Conclusion	13
Appendices	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is submitted by the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),¹ pursuant to the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act).² This report, which was prepared by Commission staff,³ is the first annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and charges by the states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. territories, and the Indian territories.

II. BACKGROUND

2. Section 101 of the NET 911 Act adds a new section 6(f)(2) to the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Wireless 911 Act), which provides:

To ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, the Commission shall submit a report within 1 year after the date of enactment of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.⁴

3. In order to collect the data necessary to compile the report, the Commission received authorization from the Office of Management Budget (OMB) to implement a data collection program.⁵ Following OMB's approval, the Commission's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (the Bureau) issued a Public Notice on February 6, 2009, soliciting specific information from state, territory,

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chairman’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

² New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-283, 122 Stat. 2620 (2008) (NET 911 Act).

³ See 47 C.F.R. § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

⁴ NET 911 Act § 101(2); Wireless 911 Act § 6(f)(2). The NET 911 Act was signed into law on July 23, 2008.

⁵ See Letter from Kevin F. Neyland, Deputy Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, to Karen Wheelless, Certifying Official, FCC, OMB Control Number 200812-3060-008 (Jan. 26, 2009).

and tribal authorities regarding the collection and use of 911/E911 funding in their jurisdictions.⁶ The Public Notice sought the following information:

- A statement as to whether or not the state has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (including a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism).
- The amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services, and the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges, for the annual period ending December 31, 2008.
- A statement describing how the funds collected are made available to localities, and whether the state has established written criteria regarding the allowable uses of the collected funds, including the legal citation to such criteria.
- A statement identifying any entity in the state that has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes, and a description of any oversight procedures established to determine that collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used to implement or support 911 or E911.
- A statement whether all the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used for the implementation or support of 911 or E911.
- A statement identifying what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including a statement identifying the unrelated purposes for which the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used.
- Any other comments the respondent may wish to provide regarding the applicable funding mechanism for 911 and E911.

4. On February 23, 2009, the Bureau sent letters to the Office of the Governor of each state and territory and the Regional Directors of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requesting the information sought in the Public Notice. The Bureau also sent copies of the Public Notice to the Secretary of State, Public Utility Commission Chairman, and 911 Director of each state and equivalent offices in the territories. The Public Notice and letters set a due date for submission of information of March 23, 2009. On April 10, 2009, the Bureau sent Second Notice letters via certified mail to those states and territories that had not yet replied to the initial request for information. Similarly, on April 14, 2009, the Bureau sent Second Notice letters via certified mail to the Offices of the Regional Directors of those BIA regions that had not yet replies to the initial request for information. On April 29-30, 2009, Bureau staff placed telephone calls to states, territories and BIA Offices that had not yet responded. The Bureau made further outreach calls on June 24-25, 2009 to certain non-responding states and territories. The Bureau made final outreach phone calls to states on July 8, 2009. The Bureau also took various other measures to ensure a complete response, including announcing the information collection requirement at various

⁶ Information Collection Mandated By the New and Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008, PS Docket No. 09-14, *Public Notice*, 24 FCC Rcd 1344 (PSHSB 2009).

public safety-oriented meetings and conferences, and outreach to relevant national public safety organizations.

5. The Bureau received information from every state and from the District of Columbia.⁷ As for the U.S. territories, we received responses from Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa; we did not receive responses from the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands.⁸ We did not receive many responses from the BIA offices regarding the status of 911/E911 for Indian Tribes. The responses that the Commission received are attached to this report as Appendix B.

III. DISCUSSION

6. Based upon the information gathered from the responding states, and territories, this report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in 2008, how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds, and how much they collected. The report then describes the extent to which states spent the collected 911/E911 funds on programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services.

A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges

7. States use a variety of methods to collect and distribute 911/E911 fees. Table 1 provides an overview of whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction), by local jurisdictions, or through a combination of the two.

Table 1

Type of Collection	Number of States
State Collection	24
Local Authority	11
Hybrid	19

8. Twenty-four respondents provide for statewide E911 fees that are collected by the state and then either distributed to counties or administered directly by the state.⁹ Maine, for example, reports that it imposes a statewide surcharge on monthly telephone bills, and administers the collection and expenditure of 911 funds within the state.¹⁰ The Maine statute granting the state authority to collect and administer 911 funds created an Emergency Services Communications Bureau within the State Public Utility Commission, which implements and manages the 911/E911 system. This system serves the entire state, including Indian tribes within Maine.¹¹

⁷ While Nevada did not provide a single state-level response, several Nevada counties, representing the major population centers, provided information. The Commission received responses from Carson City Fire Department, Douglas County, Elko County, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and Washoe County. Elko County and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department report that they do not charge a 911/E911 surcharge.

⁸ American Samoa reported that it does not impose any fees or charges in connection with 911/E911 services, so Guam and Puerto Rico are the only territories discussed in this report.

⁹ This category includes Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico.

¹⁰ See Maine Response at 1-2.

¹¹ *Id.* at 2.

9. Eleven states allow counties and other local jurisdictions to establish funding mechanisms for 911 and E911 purposes, subject to state statutory requirements.¹² Colorado is typical of such states. In Colorado, state statutes authorize local governing bodies to charge fees to support 911 services with certain restrictions.¹³ Under the Colorado statutes, local governing bodies impose an emergency telephone charge for emergency telephone services to cover the costs of “equipment, installation, and other directly related costs.”¹⁴ This charge may not exceed seventy cents per month per “exchange access facility, per wireless communications access, and per interconnected [VoIP] service in those portions of the governing body’s jurisdiction for which emergency telephone service will be provided.”¹⁵

10. Nineteen states employ a hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies or providers are allowed to collect surcharges from customers.¹⁶ For instance, Illinois reports that it allows local governments to establish “Emergency Telephone System Boards” that set and distribute telephone bill surcharges, but also empowers the Illinois Commerce Commission to levy and collect surcharges on wireless subscribers.¹⁷ The Illinois Commerce Commission has created two separate funds through its surcharge – one to reimburse wireless carriers for 911 costs and the other to pay for wireless 911 services.¹⁸ Guam reports that it requires each Local Exchange Carrier (LEC) and Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) provider to collect a one dollar per month surcharge per access line up to a maximum of 25 access lines per account. Each LEC and CMRS provider then remits the amounts collected to the Department of Administration through the Treasurer of Guam.¹⁹

11. Table 2 indicates whether each state controls the expenditures of funds collected from 911/E911 surcharges. States that responded “no” to this question typically cede control of 911/E911 funds to local jurisdictions.

Table 2

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
Alabama	Yes
Alaska	No
Arizona	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
California	Yes
Colorado	No
Connecticut	Yes
Delaware	Yes
District of Columbia	Yes

¹² This category includes Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

¹³ See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102.

¹⁴ See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102(1)(a).

¹⁵ Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102(2)(a).

¹⁶ This category includes Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

¹⁷ Illinois Response at 1.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ Guam Response at 2; Guam Public Law No. 25-55.

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Guam	Yes
Hawaii	Yes
Idaho	No
Illinois	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Indiana	Yes
Iowa	Yes
Kansas	Of the four programs, only one is administered by the State.
Kentucky	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Louisiana	No
Maine	Yes
Maryland	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Mississippi	No
Missouri	No
Montana	Yes
Nebraska	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Nevada	No. ²⁰
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	Yes
New Mexico	Yes
New York	State oversight for state funds. Local oversight for local funds.
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	No
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Puerto Rico	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	No
Tennessee	No, but subject to audit.
Texas	Yes
Utah	No
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes

²⁰ While the State of Nevada did not provide information on this subject, the Carson City Fire Department indicated in its response that “the State of Nevada doesn’t track, or keep records on the fees charged for this [911/E911] purpose.”

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
Washington	Yes
West Virginia	No, but subject to audit.
Wisconsin	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Wyoming	No

B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2008

12. Table 3 shows the reported amount of money collected by various states, territories, and in a few cases, political subdivisions, for the year ending December 31, 2008. The fees range from a low of \$1,468,363 in Guam to an estimated high of \$190,239,804.99 in Pennsylvania. Some states did not provide an estimate of the amount raised. Some states provided separate figures for wireless and wireline services (and, in one case, for VoIP services as well). Other states provided separate figures for charges collected locally and those collected at the state level.

Table 3

State	Funds Collected in 2008
Alabama	Wireline: \$32,000,000.00 (est.)
	Wireless: \$28,465,103.67
Alaska	Did not provide
Arizona	\$15,056,353.00
Arkansas	\$24,799,338.00 (est.)
California	\$106,817,446.59
Colorado	\$45,000,000.00 (est.)
Connecticut	\$20,116,090.61
Delaware	Did not provide
District of Columbia	\$12,744,103.00
Florida	Wireline: \$53,510,624.00
	Wireless: \$77,451,429.00
Georgia	Did not provide
Guam	\$1,468,363.00
Hawaii	Wireline: \$1,400,000.00 (est.)
	Wireless: \$7,442,841.49 (est.)
Idaho	\$19,191,409.99
Illinois	Did not provide

State	Funds Collected in 2008
Indiana	Wireline: \$45,000,000.00
	Wireless: \$26,000,000.00
Iowa	Wireline: \$13,327,484.00
	Wireless: \$15,727,138.00
Kansas	Did not provide
Kentucky	\$23,569,921.00
Louisiana	Did not provide
Maine	\$6,664,062.00
Maryland	\$57,176,923.16
Massachusetts	Did not provide
Michigan	Counties: \$46,276,851.00
	State: \$23,558,820.59
Minnesota	\$51,281,641.00
Mississippi	\$11,758,733.12
Missouri	Did not provide
Montana	\$13,172,462.14
Nebraska	Wireline: \$7,771,667.39
	Wireless: \$5,507,239.80
Nevada	Did not provide
New Hampshire	\$10,854,202.82
New Jersey	\$130,000,000.00
New Mexico	\$12,786,327.64
New York	No estimate for 2008
	2007 estimate for state: \$19,200,000.00
	2007 estimate for New York City: \$62,900,000.00
North Carolina	\$84,613,672.00
North Dakota	No estimate for 2008
	2007 estimate: \$8,203,884.00
Ohio	Wireless: \$28,544,923.91
Oklahoma	Did not provide
Oregon	\$87,447,639.72
Pennsylvania	Wireline: \$91,260,664.56

State	Funds Collected in 2008
	Wireless: \$98,560,282.00
	VoIP: \$418,858.43
Puerto Rico	\$20,952,458.73
Rhode Island	\$19,400,000.00
South Carolina	Wireless: Over \$22,000,000.00 (est.)
	Wireline: Did not provide
South Dakota	Did not provide
Tennessee	\$51,536,089.00
Texas	Wireline: \$78,531,345.27
	Wireless: \$100,338,737.00
	Equalization Surcharge: \$18,358,713.61
Utah	Local: \$20,659,351.00
	State: \$2,706,950.00
Vermont	\$4,832,374.02
Virginia	Did not provide
Washington	County: \$49,659,402.00
	State: \$19,863,761.00
West Virginia	\$32,278,728.00
Wisconsin	Wireline: Did not provide
	Wireless: \$9,602,745.46
Wyoming	\$6,700,000 (est.)

C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services

13. The majority of respondents – 30 states, plus Guam, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia – indicate that 911/E911 surcharges are used only for 911/E911 purposes. Twelve states, however, report that collected funds are or may be used, at least in part, to support programs other than 911 and E911.

14. States that reported that they use 911/E911 funds for other purposes indicated that they use the collected money for a variety of reasons, primarily related to other emergency first responder programs. Utah, for example, states that its Automated Geographic Reference Center receives an amount equal to 1 cent per month to enhance and upgrade statewide digital mapping.²¹ Some states allow a portion of collected fees to be used to “cover program costs.”²² Five states (Illinois, Maine, Oregon, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) report that they used money collected for 911/E911 to assist in closing the state’s general fund, although Tennessee used only interest accrued on the collected funds.²³ In its original filing, Wisconsin stated that it collected approximately \$25 million in excess of actual requests for funds submitted by 911 grant applicants and that, while it has used some of the excess for administrative costs, it has not made a final decision on the balance of the money.²⁴ Wisconsin stated in a further filing that the E911 funding program was established to recover the amounts needed to pay for approved grants given to counties/providers for E911 expenditures.²⁵ When the program ended per state statute, the money collected exceeded the amount necessary to pay for approved grants.²⁶ Excess money was then used for other needs in the state budget.²⁷ Wisconsin notes that all providers and counties were fully compensated for the amount of their approved grants and requests for reimbursement.²⁸ Rhode Island deposits collected funds directly into the General Fund. In 2008, Rhode Island reports that, in 2008, approximately \$13,600,000 was used for purposes other than 911 and E911.²⁹ Virginia did not indicate any non-911/E911 spending for 2008. However, in its current proposed budget, wireless E911 funds would be used to support sheriff’s dispatchers.³⁰

15. Seven states report that they were unable to confirm that funds collected and administered at the local level were used solely for 911/E911 purposes because they do not have oversight authority in the matter. Florida reports that 911/E911 fees are collected and spent at both the state and county level. While Florida reports that it does not use any state-level funds for non 911-related purposes, there is no formal state audit of counties and the state cannot attest as to how county funds are utilized. Florida reports that its statutes prohibit counties from using E911 money for purposes other than E911.³¹ Georgia states that it is unable to provide this information because, “[a]s of the date of [Georgia’s] report the state fiscal year 2010 budget has not been approved,” and “[u]ntil such time as the state fiscal year 2010 budget is signed into law by the Governor, the State is unable to report on whether funds collected should have been made available or used for the purposes designated in the funding mechanism.”³²

²¹ Utah Response at 2.

²² These states include Illinois, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, and Wisconsin.

²³ See Maine Response at 2; Oregon Response at 2; Tennessee Response at 7.

²⁴ Wisconsin Response at 6.

²⁵ E-mail from Gary Evenson, Administrator – Telecommunications Division, Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, to Aaron Garza, Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission (July 7, 2009).

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ Rhode Island Response at 3.

³⁰ Virginia Response at 2. The budget proposes that \$6 million be transferred from the Wireless E911 Fund to the Compensation Board. *Id.*

³¹ Florida Response at 3.

³² Georgia Response at 3.

16. In short, at the state level, most states used the 911/E911 fees they collected in 2008 strictly to fund 911/E911 services. Many of the remaining states use some 911/E911 fees for related expenses, such as to cover the administrative costs of collecting the fees, or for other public safety purposes (such as public safety radio communications). Below, Table 4 summarizes the reported uses of revenue in the states that reported using 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.

Table 4

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Idaho	Statutes allow for the use of 911 funds for public safety radio. ³³
Illinois	Wireline carriers are allowed to keep 3% of wireline funds collected each month to defray administrative costs. ³⁴ The Illinois Commerce Commission is allowed to use up to \$.01 per wireless surcharge to recover administrative costs. ³⁵ Illinois' Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund has had \$16.8 million in transfers to the State's General Revenue Fund or for administrative charges to the state between July 2003 and 2009. ³⁶ This is primarily due to funds being unused by wireless carriers. State law has been amended to allow "excess funds" to be transferred once a year to the State's Wireless Service Emergency Fund (which goes directly to the 911 centers). ³⁷
Maine	During calendar year 2008, the Maine Legislature transferred \$2,623,253 from the E911 fund to the general fund. ³⁸
Montana	911 revenues to support program's administrative costs are deposited in the state's General Fund. ³⁹ General Fund deposits have outpaced the 911 program's administrative costs. ⁴⁰ Current statute does not allow for excess general fund deposits for the program's administrative costs to be transferred to the special revenue account to be distributed to 911 jurisdictions. ⁴¹ The 2009 Legislature has approved a bill that creates a special revenue fund for the administrative costs and reduces 911 funds being deposited into the General Fund for the program's administrative costs. ⁴² Upon the Governor's signature, the bill will be effective July 1, 2009. ⁴³
Nebraska	\$167,633.33 was used for administrative costs. ⁴⁴

³³ Idaho Response at 3.

³⁴ Illinois Response at 1.

³⁵ Illinois Response at 2.

³⁶ Illinois Response at 5.

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ Maine Response at 2.

³⁹ Montana Response at 2.

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ Nebraska Response at 5.

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
New Jersey	Funds deposited in a 911 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account and applied to offset the costs of several programs, including: Dept. Health and Senior Services - Disease Surveillance; Interdepartmental - State Police Emergency Ops Center and Multipurpose Bldg. + Troop C Headquarters.; Dept. Law and Public Safety - Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness; State Police - CAD System, Forensic Lab, Vehicle Purchases, Central Monitoring Station, Radio Upgrade, Emergency Ops Center (Operating), and Remaining Operating Budget; Dept. of Military and Veteran's Affairs - National Guard and Support Services; and Dept. of Treasury - Statewide 911 Emergency Telephone System, E911 Grants, and OETS. ⁴⁵
New York	In 2008-2009, \$10 million was transferred from the balance of the Local Wireless account to provide relief for the state's General Fund, which was facing a substantial deficit. Transfer authorized by statute. ⁴⁶
Oregon	In February 2009, the Oregon Legislature reallocated \$35 million from the 911 fund, sub account Equipment Replacement Account, to the State's general fund. ⁴⁷ This is the first instance of this type of legislative action since the tax/fund was established in 1981. ⁴⁸
Rhode Island	Funds collected for 911/E911 go directly to the General Fund. Approximately \$13,600,000 was used in 2008 for purposes other than 911/E911. ⁴⁹
Tennessee	Interest accrued on funds (\$10,000,000) collected for 911/E911 was used for "the purpose of closing the general fund at June 30, 2008." ⁵⁰
Utah	State's Automated Geographic Reference Center in the Division of Integrated Technology of the Department of Technology Services receives an amount equal to one cent per month levied on telecommunications service to enhance and upgrade statewide digital mapping standards. ⁵¹ The 1 cent is taken from the eight cents collected for the state. ⁵² Tax Commission is authorized to retain up to 1.5% for the collection and distribution of 911 funds. ⁵³
Wisconsin	For wireless, the 911 Fund collected approximately \$25 million in excess of actual requests for funds submitted by 911 grant applicants. ⁵⁴ A small portion of that collection was applied to the salary expense that the Commission incurred to administer the program. ⁵⁵ Excess funds were used to assist in closing the General Fund. ⁵⁶

⁴⁵ New Jersey Response at 5-6.

⁴⁶ New York Response at 4.

⁴⁷ Oregon Response at 2.

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ Rhode Island Response at 3.

⁵⁰ Tennessee Response at 7.

⁵¹ Utah Response at 2.

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ Wisconsin Response at 6.

⁵⁵ *Id.*

D. Indian Tribes

17. Because of a low response rate among BIA offices, and because many BIA offices do not collect information regarding 911/E911 funding among Indian tribes, the Commission does not have a clear picture of Indian tribe use of 911/E911 funds. The Commission requested information from the twelve regional BIA offices.⁵⁷ Only five offices responded, and only two, the BIA offices for the Eastern Region and for the Great Plains Region, indicated that they collected information on 911/E911 funding.

18. The Eastern Region BIA Office indicates that no tribe within its jurisdiction has established a funding mechanism for 911/E911.⁵⁸ The Great Plains Region BIA Office indicates that the 911 systems for the Indian tribes within its district are managed by state and local authorities.⁵⁹ Thus, no money is collected by Indian tribes within their jurisdiction. Finally, Maine reports that its state system serves the Indian tribes within the state.⁶⁰

IV. CONCLUSION

19. The Commission is pleased to have the opportunity to report on the issue of 911 fee collection and distribution. In this initial report, we have been able to report on the practices of almost every state and territory. The information that the states provided indicates that in 2008, most of the 911/E911 fees collected by the states were in fact used to fund 911/E911 services, and only twelve states reported using, or potentially using, 911 fees to support other services.

⁵⁶ See E-mail from Gary Evenson, Administrator – Telecommunications Division, Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, to Aaron Garza, Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission (July 7, 2009).

⁵⁷ The BIA has twelve regional offices, organized by geographical location: Alaska Region, Eastern Oklahoma Region, Eastern Region, Southern Plains Region, Great Plains Region, Midwest Region, Navajo Region, Northwest Region, Pacific Region, Rocky Mountain Region, Southwest Region, and Western Region.

⁵⁸ BIA Eastern Regional Office Response at 1.

⁵⁹ BIA Great Plains Regional Office Response at 1.

⁶⁰ Maine Response at 2.

APPENDIX A

Summary of State Responses

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Alabama	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$32,000,000.00 (est.)	N/A
			Wireless: \$28,465,103.67	
Alaska	Local	No	Did not provide	N/A
Arizona	State	Yes	\$15,056,353.00	N/A
Arkansas	Hybrid	Yes	\$24,799,338.00 (est.)	N/A
California	State	Yes	\$106,817,446.59	N/A
Colorado	Local	No	\$45,000,000.00 (est.)	N/A
Connecticut	State	Yes	\$20,116,090.61	N/A
Delaware	State	Yes	Did not provide	N/A
District of Columbia	N/A	Yes	\$12,744,103.00	N/A
Florida	State	Yes	Wireline: \$53,510,624.00	N/A
			Wireless: \$77,451,429.00	
Georgia	State	Yes	Did not provide	N/A
Guam	State	Yes	\$1,468,363.00	N/A
Hawaii	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$1,400,000.00 (est.)	N/A
			Wireless: \$7,442,841.49 (est.)	
Idaho	Local	No	\$19,191,409.99	Yes

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Illinois	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; Local control for wireline	Did not provide	Yes
Indiana	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$45,000,000.00	N/A
			Wireless: \$26,000,000.00	
Iowa	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$13,327,484.00	N/A
			Wireless: \$15,727,138.00	
Kansas	Hybrid	Of four programs, one is administered by the state	Did not provide	N/A
Kentucky	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline	\$23,569,921.00	N/A
Louisiana	Local	No	Did not provide	N/A
Maine	State	Yes	\$6,664,062.00	Yes
Maryland	Hybrid	Yes	\$57,176,923.16	N/A
Massachusetts	State	Yes	Did not provide	N/A
Michigan	Hybrid	Yes	Counties: \$46,276,851.00	N/A
			State: \$23,558,820.59	
Minnesota	State	Yes	\$51,281,641.00	N/A
Mississippi	Local	No	\$11,758,733.12	N/A
Missouri	Hybrid	No	Did not provide	N/A
Montana	State	Yes	\$13,172,462.14	Yes
Nebraska	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for	Wireline: \$7,771,667.39	Yes

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
		wireline	Wireless: \$5,507,239.80	
Nevada	Local	Did not provide	Did not provide	Did not provide
New Hampshire	State	Yes	\$10,854,202.82	N/A
New Jersey	State	Yes	\$130,000,000.00	Yes
New Mexico	State	Yes	\$12,786,327.64	N/A
New York	Hybrid	State oversight for state funds; local oversight for local funds	No estimate for 2008	Yes
			Estimate for 2007: \$19,200,000.00	
			2007 estimate for New York City: \$62,900,000.00	
North Carolina	State	Yes	\$84,613,672.00	N/A
North Dakota	Local	No	No estimate for 2008	N/A
			Estimate for 2007: \$8,203,884.00	
Ohio	Hybrid	No	Wireless: \$28,544,923.91	N/A
Oklahoma	Local	No	Did not provide	N/A
Oregon	State	Yes	\$87,447,639.72	Yes
Pennsylvania	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$91,260,664.56	N/A
			Wireless: \$98,560,282.00	
			VoIP: \$418,858.43	
Puerto Rico	State	Yes	\$20,952,458.73	N/A
Rhode Island	State	Yes	\$19,400,000.00	Yes
South Carolina	Hybrid	Yes	Wireless: \$22,000,000.00 (est.)	N/A

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
			Wireline: Did not provide	
South Dakota	Hybrid	No	Did not provide	N/A
Tennessee	State	No, but subject to audit	\$51,536,089.00	Yes
Texas	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$78,531,345.27	N/A
			Wireless: \$100,338,737.00	
			Equalization Surcharge: \$18,358,713.61	
Utah	Hybrid	No	Local: \$20,659,351.00	Yes
			State: \$2,706,950.00	
Vermont	State	Yes	\$4,832,374.02	N/A
Virginia	Hybrid	Yes	Did not provide	N/A
Washington	Hybrid	Yes	Counties: \$49,659,402.00	N/A
			State: \$19,863,761.00	
West Virginia	Hybrid	No, but subject to audit	\$32,278,728.00	N/A
Wisconsin	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline	Wireline: Did not provide	Yes
			Wireless: \$9,602,745.46	
Wyoming	Local	No	\$6,700,000 (est.)	N/A

APPENDIX B
Copies of Responses